

REMARKS

Claim 32 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mourant et al. (U.S. Patent 6,396,362) in view of Gutierrez (U.S. Patent 5,969,590).

Claim 32 recites "wherein each of the at least two transmission lines in each said conductor is ... broadside-coupled to at least one transmission line of another said conductor."

As recited by U.S. Patent 6,407,647 (Serial No. 09/768,865), which was incorporated by reference, "broadside-coupled ... transmission lines are vertically aligned, giving rise to transmission line coupling between the conductors". (U.S. Patent 6,407,647, Col. 2, line 65 to Col. 3, line 1.)

This usage is followed in the present application, wherein transmission lines that are identified as having "broadside coupling" exhibit a vertical alignment. For example, the specification as originally filed recites "By reference to Fig. 4, it will be understood that broadside coupling occurs between lines 102A and 104B and between lines 104A and 102B". (Specification, Page 6, lines 1-3.) As illustrated in Fig. 4, lines 102A and 104B exhibit a vertical alignment, and lines 104A and 102B exhibit a vertical alignment. (Specification, Fig. 4.)

Increased coupling (including broadside coupling) advantageously results in reduced transformer losses. (See, Specification, Page 6, lines 3-9.)

In contrast, Mourant et al. teach that lines of the same conductor should be broadside-coupled. This is clearly shown in Fig. 8A of Mourant et al., which illustrates that lines of the primary winding (labeled "P") are broadside-coupled, and lines of the secondary winding (labeled "S") are broadside coupled.

Because Mourant et al. fail to teach that any line of the primary winding is broadside-coupled to any line of the secondary winding, Mourant et al. fail to teach "each of the at

least two transmission lines in each said conductor is ... broadside-coupled to at least one transmission line of another said conductor" as recited by Claim 32.

Gutierrez, which is cited to show an integrated circuit package, does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Mourant et al.

For these reasons, Claim 32 is allowable over Mourant et al. in view of Gutierrez.

Applicant notes the allowance of Claims 14-31 and 36-39.

Claims 33-35 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base Claim 32. The Examiner has indicated that these Claims 33-35 would be allowable if re-written in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Because Applicant believes that base Claim 32 is allowable for reasons presented above, Applicant is not amending Claims 33-35 at this time.

CONCLUSION

Claims 14-39 are pending in the present application. Claims 14-31 and 36-39 are allowed. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 32-35 is requested. If there are any questions or comments, please telephone the undersigned at (925) 895-3545.

Respectfully submitted,



E. Eric Hoffman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 38,186

Customer No.: 022888

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450.

10/22/04 Carrie Reddick  
Date Signature: Carrie Reddick